2: Hockings E-4,5 (1962-1977) 1980
AN50 Badaga AN50

554 generality and have different relevance depending upon circumstances. An individual's position on each of these contrasts constitutes a role, entailing certain well-recognized expectations of behaviour on appropriate occasions.

182 554 How does a social system fragmented by cross-cutting divisions keep from falling apart into small splinter groups? The answer lies with the interaction patterns which are indicative of social cohesion, which mark out the clusters of networks and which counteract the long-standing factional disputes. Four major types of public reciprocity, of which the first is the most widespread, hold together the people separated by these cleavages: (1) public discussions; (2) the exchange of women in marriage; (3) joint participation in ceremonial meals; and (4) the exchange of goods and services. All four are types of communication, and to operate as such they must depend on network clusters; in other words, reciprocity can only be maintained on a continuing basis when it activates a persisting social structure. Badagas do not offer their goods, their meals, their daughters or even their conversation in a haphazard way to *anybody*: the social structure, analysed by Badagas in terms of these dyadic contrasts, determines quite clearly who shall receive certain goods and services, who shall marry the daughters and so on. Not only is the pattern of reciprocity dictated by the social structure—by the positioning of network clusters—but it in turn gives coherence to that structure: there is a dialectical process in the integration of the society. If Badagas were to recognize the emergent socio-economic classes as a new criterion of social differentiation their communication networks, patterns of reciprocity and system of role allocation would all have to be drastically revised. At present they prefer to (178) think somewhat anachronistically in terms of their old social organization, for it provides a reassuring stability to present-day social relations.

156 ● 183 Although the social system assigns an individual to certain positions from birth, however, he continuously adapts himself to what he perceives of the shifting organization of network-clusters. In these adaptations the individual has a certain amount of choice. It is clearly limited by what he considers to be the relevant expectations of his fellows; but cultural norms do not dictate role change so absolutely that a man is unable to exercise his personal preferences. Cultural orientations are used by a Badaga to bolster or direct his motivations in the pursuit of the valued ends of his

2: Hockings E-4,5 (1962-1977) 1980
AW50 Badaga AW50

life. While he is busily making a living, gaining respect and maintaining status he apparently goes through a continuing process of re-evaluating these activities in the light of changing conditions and new information. Such re-evaluation takes the dual form of private thought or meditation and of informal public discussions about his clique, their friends, and their various attitudes to life. So important is this re-evaluation process that many men can be seen devoting a major part of their waking time to it. The womenfolk are equally concerned with re-evaluation through conversations, but are obliged to work physically at the same time (Harkness, 1832, 114; Metz, 1864, 98–99; Benbow, 1930, 3–5; Vivekanandam Pillai, 1937, 247; Subrahmanyam, 1962, 5–6; see Plate 10). In such discussions Badagas experience the need to make manifest from time to time the norms by which their behaviour is guided. This process not only makes the norms explicit but reinforces their validity in most cases, too. At the same time ambiguous or anachronistic norms are subject to scrutiny and then modification or total rejection. In view of this re-evaluation process it is no longer enough to know that a modern Badaga is a male of a certain age, from a certain village and phratry or of one particular category in their social system in order to predict how he will conduct himself in any given situation. We also need to understand the more transient social formations and networks with which he is associated, the social functions of these formations and networks, and also the manner in which their members are recruited. As I have observed on many occasions, the play of elementary logic, of conflicting orientations, personalities and proverbs, the relevance of everything said to everyone within earshot are all factors making for fascinating and valuable conversation among Badagas. Slowly yet dynamically their culture is changing, not simply through external programmes devised for the modernization of India, but consciously, indeed conscientiously, through this tedious and time-consuming procedure. Faced with the need to vote for a variety of parliamentary candidates, confronted with propaganda on the value of family planning or with another current topic, individuals discuss the issues, try to reach a consensus and then act accordingly.

Those cleavages in the social system across which conversation is not permissible are barriers to the free flow of communication, and on either side of these barriers variant orientations develop. To understand cultural change we should pay some attention to

8: Hockings E-5 (1962-1977) 1982 AN50 Badaga AN50

As in any society, the family among the Badagas does not show one kind of structure only. A sample of 420 Badagas of both sexes, in 1963, revealed the range of households indicated in Table 5. I equate "family" with "household" here because among Badagas the residential unit is equally a commensal unit of a kind that is always recognized to be a family. What this table emphasizes is that only about 15% of Badaga households are joint families, and only about 3% are polygynous, even though both of these types are acceptable, and indeed the former is considered the ideal. It is an ideal which cannot however be realised continuously over a long period of time. There is a natural cycle of growth, florescence, and decline in the Badaga family, a cycle whose stages are approximately the same as the sequence of the first eight household types listed in Table 5. Once a household contains several brothers with their wives and children, it usually becomes necessary for them to split up into a number of nuclear families occupying different homes because there is no longer enough physical space and cooking facilities for all of them in what is typically a three-roomed house. It is noteworthy that in 1963 only 4.3% of the respondents belonged to a full joint family in which both of the grandparents were still living. This fact should be viewed against the backdrop of Table 1, which indicates that 19% of the male sample had more than one owned house available to them. Where alternative housing is available within the family the joint residential unit, no longer a necessity, may cease to seem so virtuous or practicable to its members either.

TABLE 5

Badaga Household Structure

	Respondents' households
Nuclear family:	
Living alone, or with spouse	45.2%
Couple with children	19.8%
Mother with unmarried children	0.7%
Father with unmarried children	13.3%
Sub-Total:	79.0%
Joint family:	
Parents, sons, their wives and children	4.3%
Mother, sons, their wives and children	5.5%
Father, sons, their wives and children	3.6%
Several siblings with spouses and their children	2.1%
Sub-Total:	15.5%
Polygynous family:	2.9%
Other, supplemented nuclear or joint families:	2.6%
	(*N*=420)